



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 September 2020 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/20/3252897

126 & 128 Sandy Hill Road, Woolwich, SE18 7BA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Michael Vuong against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/0107/F, dated 12 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is: Construction of single storey rear infill extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the construction of single storey rear infill extensions, at 126 & 128 Sandy Hill Road, Woolwich, SE18 7BA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0107/F, dated 12 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01A, 02, 03, 04, 05 and 06
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development, hereby permitted, shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Work shall not commence on the construction of the extension to the rear of No. 126 Sandy Hill Road unless work has also commenced on the construction of the extension to the rear of No. 128 or vice versa. Prior to the occupation of the approved extension to the rear of either property, the approved extension on the adjoining property must have been substantially completed and capable of occupation and use in accordance with the approved plans.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The appeal site is formed of two neighbouring two storey terraced properties. Each property has a two storey rear addition which covers part of the rear

elevation and which is paired with their respective neighbours. At ground floor level the properties have previously been extended beyond these rear additions. The result is two substantial ground floor extensions which are separated by a modest gap at either side of the shared boundary.

4. The appeal site sits in a terraced row within a perimeter block where the rear elevations of a number of properties have been significantly altered as a result of single storey and first floor extensions. This has resulted in the once traditional and uniformed character of the rear terrace being significantly altered with no apparent consistency in design, size or form of development.
5. The proposal would see the space between the paired additions and the existing rear extensions infilled with a single storey development that would project out in line with the rear extensions and up to the shared boundary.
6. Whilst the proposed depth of the extensions taken from the original rear elevation would appear excessive, in the context of the site they appear to infill the remaining ground floor area between the two properties. As the development would not exceed beyond the existing rear extensions on either property, and as a result of the existing boundary treatments and surrounding trees, which also provides some screening, the proposal at ground floor would appear as a subservient addition when viewed from within the perimeter block.
7. Furthermore, the alteration would have limited impact on the apparent scale of the properties when viewed from within the block. The main views would take in the first-floor staggered elevation, which retains a degree of subservience to the original form, and the loss of the small void on the ground floor would not be visually prominent or detrimental to the overall character and appearance of the property or wider area.
8. As such, although the extensions would appear excessively long, if considered in isolation, the context of the site is such that the proposed addition would appear modest in relation to the existing built form and the visual impact would be limited. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the fundamental aims of the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (2018) which seeks new development proposals to be sensitive to the original building and respects the character of the area.
9. The proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would comply with Policies DH1 and DH (a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan which seeks to ensure that development is of high quality that relates to its context, and respects the character of an area.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and to require that the development is carried out in accordance with them as this provides certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the finished building, a condition is attached to require that the external materials match those of the existing dwelling.
11. The Council seek to add a condition which prevents the use of the flat roof as a terrace, roof garden or similar amenity area, however, there is nothing before me that suggest this would be the case and therefore I do not consider this

condition to be reasonable or necessary. Any future development that requires planning permission would be subject to a separate planning application.

12. The Council also seek a condition that prior to the occupation of either extension, the proposal on the adjoining property must be substantially built. If one extension was completed without the other it would have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of the neighbouring property due to the enclosure of the small courtyard at the rear. Consequently, a condition that seeks to ensure both extensions are constructed together is reasonable and necessary in order to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. After consulting the parties, I am satisfied that the evidence indicates that both extensions will be constructed simultaneously, and the parties have raised no objection to the condition and the application is put forward as a single scheme. Therefore, based on the specific circumstances of the case I am satisfied that it is reasonable to impose such a condition. I have added to the Council's wording to ensure preciseness and taken account of the wording of the condition of a similar nature, attached to another appeal decision, that has been put forward by the Council.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, agree that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR